

Attorney Docket No. MP/143

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant : Walter  
Appl. No. : 09/369,231  
Filed : August 5, 1999  
Title : Surface Modified Expanded  
Polytetrafluoroethylene Devices and  
Methods of Producing the Same  
Group Art Unit: 1771  
Examiner : H. Vo

*I hereby certify that this correspondence is being  
facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark  
Office on January 13, 2003.*

*Melanee Williams*  
Melanee Williams

Honorable Assistant Commissioner of Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

**FAX RECEIVED**  
JAN 14 2003  
**GROUP 1700**

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION OF AUGUST 13, 2002**

Dear Sir:

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.111, applicant responds to the Office Action of August 13, 2002, as follows.

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action of August 13, 2003, each of claims 1-7, 10 and 12-27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 37 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over US Patent 4,734,112 to Okita et al. ("Okita et al. patent") or US Patent 5,466,509 to Kowligi et al. ("Kowligi et al. patent"). As is explained below, neither the Okita et al. patent nor the Kowligi et al. patent in any way teaches or suggests the present invention as claimed. Reconsideration and allowance of the present claims are respectfully requested.

In the present Office Action it is asserted that the Okita et al. patent teaches a PTFE film having a surface formed by laser treatment. Office Action of August 13, 2002, at 2. Further, it is asserted that the Kowligi et al. patent discloses a porous, expanded PTFE film having its surface treated with a laser beam. *Id.* The Office then concludes that since both of these prior patents teach treating PTFE surfaces with lasers, they must inherently possess the same surface claimed in the present application:

Since Applicant is using the same approach to modify the expanded PTFE surface, it is the examiner's position that the claimed microstructure of the expanded PTFE